



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

withdraw and refuse to fight than to be guilty of the folly and wickedness of opening a war, such as this would be. This would be a Christian deed on a national scale, the glory of which would never fade.

But both nations have gone astray. Let the friends of peace speak with perfect fairness and impartiality. Let them condemn error at home as well as on the other side of the sea. Great Britain has done a great wrong, to Venezuela, to herself, to all the world, in refusing to arbitrate. She has denied herself. Let the British friends of peace continue to tell her this to her face, as they are doing. Let them besiege the doors of the Foreign Office until the Cabinet is compelled to yield or to give way to another which will better represent the real spirit of the people. But our own government has committed in another way a no less grave wrong, as we explain more fully in another column. There has been a great demonstration of condemnation of the course which has been taken. But this must continue, until, no matter what Great Britain may or may not do, no matter what the Venezuelan Commission may or may not report, our Representatives and the Executive at Washington may be compelled to withdraw from the stand they have taken rather than be the guilty cause of war. Peace at this price would be peace with untold honor; war in this case under no matter what pretext would be war with everlasting dishonor.

Let the Christian friends of peace not forget to pray. A prayer in every church, at every fireside, in every private closet, like that made by Dr. Milburn in the Senate, would make war utterly impossible.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

What is the "Monroe doctrine." How did it originate? What application has it to any existing international questions? What purpose, if any, is it likely to serve in the future? What changes have imperceptibly taken place in the meaning of the doctrine? What moral justification is there for its further maintenance?

From the passionate way in which the famous doctrine has been bandied about by all sorts of people during the past two or three years and flung into the faces of supposed European enemies of America, it would naturally be inferred that nearly every body in this country had asked and at least attempted to give an intelligent answer to such questions as those given above. One has only to look into the papers a little and listen to people talk to become quickly convinced that the general ignorance of the subject is deplorable in the extreme. In a thoroughly sensible and intelligent article in the December *Forum* Mr. A. C. Cassatt very justly says that "a doctrine which may require the whole army and navy and treasury of the country to uphold it, and which furnishes the keynote of our relations with powerful foreign governments

on questions relating to the American Continents, merits the closest study as to its origin, its exact meaning and limitations, its binding force and its wisdom."

The two declarations in President Monroe's message of December 2, 1823, which constituted the body of the famous doctrine, were made in view of the claim of Russia to the entire western half of what is now the Dominion of Canada and the purpose of the "Holy Alliance" (of Russia, Prussia and Austria) to extend its operations to the American Continent and to restore to Ferdinand of Spain his revolted States and in general to break down republican government and to maintain the monarchical order in the western world, especially in Central and South America. Not only by the United States but by Great Britain as well were the claim of Russia and the purpose of the "Holy Alliance" looked upon with great disfavor, the former because it interfered with British claims in North America, the latter because it threatened Great Britain's growing commerce with the Central and South American States. So Great Britain urged the United States to take a firm stand against both these aggressive movements of the four European powers.

The first of President Monroe's declarations, made in the first instance through the State Department to Russia and afterwards embodied in his message to Congress, was in substance that the American Continents, being then wholly occupied by sovereign nations, would not henceforth be considered by the United States as subject to colonization by European powers. The language of the message, as may be seen by referring to it, clearly implies that this position was taken, not primarily with the view of establishing a protectorate over the other American nations, but purely in the way of self-defence, because "the rights and interest of the United States were involved."

The boundary question between the United States, Great Britain (Canada) and Russia, in the Northwest, was afterwards settled by negotiation, Russia holding what was for a time known as Russian America (now Alaska, a territory of the United States), and nothing has since ever been heard of the Monroe doctrine in that quarter.

The substance of President Monroe's second declaration in the same message, made in view of the purpose of the "Holy Alliance" of the three European monarchies to extend their campaign against free governments to the New World, was that "it is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced, that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defence;" that "we should consider any attempt on their (the European powers') part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety;" that "we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them (the independent American nations), or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European

power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States."

Looking at these famous declarations from the point of view of their origin and first purpose, the following statements are certainly tenable:

1. They were made in accord with the action of Great Britain and partly at her suggestion, that country and this both being anxious about the menaces of Russia and the "Holy Alliance," the United States wishing to preserve her independence, Great Britain desiring to have a secure title to the North American territory which she claimed and to promote her growing commerce with the Spanish American nations. The United States tacitly, though not formally, joined Great Britain in creating a "balance of power" against the "Holy Alliance," and it is a curious historical change that she should now be flinging the Monroe doctrine into the teeth of the country to whose suggestion and "moral" support it in part owes its existence, though Great Britain was then vigorously pursuing the same aggressive colonial policy, which she is now doing, and secured by it with our support nearly half of her Canadian possessions. The Monroe doctrine seems at that time to have had no application to Great Britain as she was needed by the United States to support the resistance which this country was then making to the encroachments of the Continental European powers.

2. The purpose of the Monroe declarations was to warn the European powers, particularly the three in the "Holy Alliance," that the United States would not permit any interference with her own independence, even though this interference might come indirectly and covertly through the attack and overthrow of other American nations. The protectorate which the United States proposed, uninvited, to exercise over the other American governments was entirely incidental to this main purpose of self-defence.

3. The famous doctrine was not a declaration in favor of *republics* as against *monarchies*, for there were still monarchies existing on American soil. This fact brings into greater prominence the real purpose of the Monroe declarations as stated above, namely, the preservation of the independence of the United States. Incidentally it was a strong declaration in behalf of *independent* nations as against their being made *dependencies* of powerful despotisms.

4. The suggestions of President Monroe were not taken up by the Congress to which they were made, but passed by and not officially acted upon and declared to be the policy of the country. Whatever place, therefore, the doctrine has had, it has held by reason of public sentiment, and not because of any official action.

As to the present bearings of the position taken by President Monroe and since popularly considered our "settled policy," the following propositions can be maintained:

1. "Colonization" in the sense in which it was used in the message to Congress in 1823 has never existed in this country since that time, and no European nation now has the remotest intention of reviving it. It has turned its course to other parts of the world.

2. There is no evidence whatever that any European nation or combination of nations, since the abortive attempt of Napoleon III. in Mexico, has had or now has any purpose, open or secret, of attempting to overthrow any independent government existing on American soil. Much less is this the case in regard to the United States.

3. The dispute between Great Britain (British Guiana) and Venezuela is a *boundary* dispute of long standing, and though Great Britain should take final possession of the disputed territory even by violence and in utter disregard of justice, this could not be interpreted as a violation of the Monroe doctrine unless it could be shown at the same time that she were thereby seeking to subvert the independent government of the republic and to make all Venezuela a dependency of the British Crown.

4. The main purpose of the Monroe doctrine, self-defence on the part of the United States, does not have any application to the present condition of things in the New World, both because of the change of purpose in the European powers and because the United States is now so strong that she would have nothing to fear if every nation of Central and South America were a dependency of some European monarchy. Those who assert that the application of the doctrine is still needed to ensure the safety of the United States never venture in any way to tell us how our security is or might be threatened. But in the absence of reasons they find it very convenient to call up the ghost of our ancient weakness.

5. What is now called the Monroe doctrine is not the ancient doctrine at all, of which nothing now remains in the popular conception except the idea of a protectorate over other American nations, or rather republics. This, which was incidental in the declarations of 1823, has been made the chief element in the latter-day conception, and certain other elements have crept into the definition for which President Monroe and Mr. Adams would not have liked to be held responsible. These elements include a certain overweening assumption of superiority on the part of our country in proposing to stand guard over everything in America, a determination to build up our commerce with the nations south of us without any regard to the legitimate commercial interests of European nations, and to proceed in our relations to all the world, outside of the western hemisphere, not only in a defiant but in a "spirited" and "vigorous" way.

It is needless to say, in reference to this new doctrine, that in it, so far as held by our citizens, American love of justice, independence and republican government has to a considerable extent lost its wisdom and prudence, and is in great danger of becoming a selfish aggressiveness

like that against which the ancient doctrine erected itself.

As to the moral status of the doctrine, old or new, our space will not now permit us to speak at large. There is one question, however, which we should like to ask in closing. We have often put it to individuals in private and have always got the same evasive and unsatisfactory answer. If we are under obligation as a strong independent nation to protect weak American governments against powerful European ones, why are we not morally under just the same obligation to extend our protection to any such nation anywhere on the face of the globe? The answer which has always been given us to this question is something like this: O, this is America, and we must look after her interests. European nations may do just as they please over there; it is no concern of ours; but they must keep hands off over here. As if men were not men, and right were not right, and duty were not duty, except for this half of the world!

The above article was written before the crisis of December 17 broke upon us. After studying the various opinions about the Monroe doctrine expressed since that time many of which have been thrown off hastily without study and are consequently of little worth, we see no reason materially to change our views. The divergence of sentiment on the subject is very wide, especially as to the present application of the Monroe policy. Many think it entirely applicable in its original spirit and intent. Many others believe it capable of being so extended as to apply to a boundary dispute. Others deem it to be wholly inapplicable to such a dispute. Some agree with the President that it is a part of international law. Others, including nearly all Europeans, most professors of international law in this country, and a large number of others, assert that it can in no sense be considered international law. Some "intense Americans" declare that, though it is not international law, it is a fact, whatever they may mean by that. A considerable number hold that the doctrine now has only a certain moral force and should not in any event be insisted on even "unto blood." It is likewise held by a respectable class who have examined the subject carefully that there is no more conceivable use for the doctrine, that civilization has outgrown it, that the United States does not need it, that the conditions in Europe which called it into being have practically disappeared. With the substance of this view we agree, as will be seen from the article given above. We are unable to see how at the present time the independence of the United States or the liberties and progress of the nations south of us would suffer, if the Monroe doctrine were no ewntirely abandoned.

The President has appointed Justice David J. Brewer, of the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Richard H. Alvey, of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, ex-President Andrew D. White, of New York, President Daniel C. Gilman, of Johns Hopkins University, and Frederick R. Coudert, of New York, to constitute the Venezuelan Commission.

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE FOR 1896.

With this number we begin the fifty-eighth volume of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. We have recently received by letter and otherwise many expressions of appreciation of the character of the paper, for which we are grateful. We have tried to present in a concise and interesting way the various aspects of the peace movement in different countries, so far as we have been able to discover them. It has been our endeavor likewise to discuss the subject, in its different phases, with as much intelligence, vigor, freshness and breadth of view as we have had at command. How well we have succeeded we leave to our friends to judge. The cause is worthy of the best possible effort, and we shall spare no pains in the year before us to make the *ADVOCATE* even better than heretofore.

We wish greatly to extend the circulation of the paper. Will not our friends aid us in every community? Every cent of the income of the paper, and much more, is used in maintaining and extending the circulation. Our desire is to keep as many people as possible thoroughly informed of the state and progress of the peace movement. We would gladly send the paper free to fifty thousand ministers, teachers and others if we had sufficient funds. But we have not. We shall be much pleased and encouraged if our friends will send us New Year's contributions of any amount which they can spare. We have spent all the income of the Society the past year and a thousand dollars more, and in the present condition of the country the demand upon us is greatly increased. We wish we could adequately meet it. In renewing your subscription, send the name of some new subscriber. If you will form a club of five or more subscribers in your neighborhood, we will make the price of the paper 60 cents. This ought to bring it within the reach of nearly everybody.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

At a special meeting of the Board of Directors of the American Peace Society held at Somerset St., Boston, December 23, 1895, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, and then sent to the papers of the country through the Associated Press:

War between the United States and Great Britain is a moral impossibility. Neither nation, surely not our nation, can be guilty of the awful crime of attacking the other. Threats of war by the United States are worse than a stupendous blunder. Christianity, civilization, humanity, condemn not merely war but threats of war. Justice between nations is good, especially by the powerful to the weak. Magnanimity inspires our country to seek justice for Venezuela from Britain. The Monroe doctrine means, first, the safety of the United States and, secondarily, the protection of this hemisphere from European oppression. But our safety is assured beyond question by our power. It is inconceivable folly so to extend the Monroe doctrine that boundary disputes of ancient origin, growing out of doubtful documents or data beyond our ken must imperil the peaceful progress of Christian civilization.